UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Fascism, the Jews, and the Pope - *Ellen Hörup*

Symbols, Myths, and Underlying Realities - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Israel's Training in Hardship - - - - - - - - - *Henry M. Simmons*

India, America, and England - - - - - - - - - *Haridas T. Muzumdar*

VOLUME CXXII NUMBER 7

Chicago, December 5, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 99
Jottings—J. H. H. 102

ARTICLES—

Fascism, the Jews, and the Pope—ELLEN HØRUP 102
Symbols, Myths, and Underlying Realities—VICTOR S. YARROS .. 105
Israel's Training in Hardship—HENRY M. SIMMONS 106
India, America, and England—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR 110

CORRESPONDENCE—

Our Brethren the Jews—PATRICIA SPRAGUE 112

THE FIELD—

Gandhi in Czechoslovakia—*Nofrontier News Service* 98

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Gandhi on Czechoslovakia

"The peace gained at Munich," says Gandhi in his paper *Harijan*, "is a triumph of violence; it is also its defeat . . . Czechoslovakia has a lesson for me and us in India. The Czechs could not have done anything else when they found themselves deserted by their two powerful allies. And yet I have the hardihood to say that if they had known the use of non-violence as a weapon for the defense of national honor, they would have faced the whole might of Germany with that of Italy thrown in . . . I must refuse to think that such heroism, or call it restraint, is beyond human nature. Human nature will only find itself when it fully realizes that to be human it has to cease to be beastly or brutal.

"These are not idle words I am writing. Let the Czechs know that the Working Committee (of the National Congress) wrung itself with pain while their doom was being decided. The pain was quite selfish in a way. But on that account it was the more real. For though numerically we are a big nation, in terms of Europe, that is, in terms of organized scientific violence, we are smaller than Czechoslovakia. Our liberty is not merely threatened, we are fighting to regain it. The Czechs are fully armed; we are wholly unarmed. And so the Committee sat to deliberate what its duty was by the Czechs, what part the Congress was to play if the war clouds burst on us.

"Were we to bargain with England for our liberty and appear to befriend Czechoslovakia; or were we to live up to the creed of non-violence and say in the hour of trial for afflicted humanity that, consistently with our creed, we could not associate ourselves with war even though it might ostensibly be for the defense of Czechoslovakia whose very existence was threatened for no fault of hers, or for the only fault that she was too small to defend herself singlehanded?

"The Working Committee had almost come to the conclusion that it would deny itself the opportunity of striking a bargain with England but would make its contribution to the world's peace, not to the defense of Czechoslovakia and to India's freedom, by declaring to the world its action that the way to peace with honor did not lie through the mutual slaughter of the innocents, but that it lay only and truly through the practice of organized non-violence even unto death.

"If India could gain her freedom through non-violence, as Congressmen are to believe they can, she could also defend her freedom by the same means, and hence so could a small nation like Czechoslovakia.

"I do not know what actually the Working Committee would have done if the war had come. But the war is only postponed. During the breathing time, I present the way of non-violence for acceptance by the Czechs. They do not yet know what is in store for

(*Continued on page* 111)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXII MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1938 No. 7

HYMN

O God of light and darkness,
Of evil and of good,
Thou dost not frown upon us
In stern and angry mood;
Thou dost not send damnation
From judgment-bar or throne,
But when in sin we falter,
Our sorrow is Thine own.

If hatred sears our spirits,
Thy spirit bows in woe;
If fierce contention rends us,
Thy tears in pity flow;
When war's devouring havoc
Engulfs us in despair,
Thou into hell descendest,
Our agony to share.

Thou wilt not lose nor leave us,
Thy love endureth still;
Patient and calm and changeless
Abides Thy holy will.
Thine are we till the ages
Outwatch the farthest sun,
And men at last in gladness
Proclaim, Thy will be done!

John Haynes Holmes.

THE HORROR OF NAZI GERMANY

On the Sunday morning following the first outbreaks of the Jewish pogrom in Germany, the Community Church of New York adopted a message of protest and condemnation addressed to Hans Dieckhoff, the German ambassador in Washington. This message UNITY would adopt as its own expression of outraged sentiment on this tragic occasion:

> We, the members and friends of the Community Church of New York, have assembled this day for the worship of God, Whom we have been taught to reverence as the Father of all mankind, without distinction of race, nationality, or creed.
>
> We have prayed to God for mercy and rescue for our brethren, the Jews of Germany, stricken by such horrors of persecution as outrage all sense of human decency, profane the divine ordinances of love and justice, and carry the world back to that jungle savagery from which we had believed that men had escaped forever.
>
> So, to our prayers to God, we would add our protests to you, the official representative in this country of the government responsible for this monstrous crime against our brethren, the Jews. We ask you to instruct your government of the abhorrence felt by Americans, as we believe also by Germans, for its bloody deeds. We bid you to remind your government of the outlawry it decrees upon itself by these offenses.
>
> We beg you to teach your government what it should know, that those who would heal the hostilities and still the hatreds of our time by restoring a peace of justice for all nations are rendered helpless either to speak or act in the face of these abominations against the Jews.
>
> Sir, you will be faithless to your office if you fail to inform your Fuehrer and his associates in authority that they stand condemned by the conscience of mankind, and can themselves neither ask nor receive coöperation to any end until they have purged their country and their own hearts of these assaults upon the innocent and helpless multitudes of Israel.

THE CONSCIENCE OF CHRISTENDOM AWAKENS

If there can be anything pleasant in the Jewish horror, it is the response of the churches and of the Christian conscience generally to the enormity of this offense. Christendom, be it said, has not been any too alert in protest against the treatment of Jews in Germany. It has been to us something of a tragedy and shame that German Christians said little and did less when Hitler's attack upon Israel began in the earliest days of his regime. Had these Christians known how soon they were themselves to be engulfed in the flood of Nazi persecution, they might have cried out when their brethren in the synagogues were assailed. As the "dry" pogrom went on, it might have been expected that Christians in other lands would have been outraged by this latest outbreak of anti-Semitism, and spoken their denunciation. There were churches and clergymen who called upon the Nazis to desist; there were occasional protest meetings under Christian auspices; but on the whole the reaction was lukewarm. Now, however, the dikes have broken. In England, France, America, the world around, Christendom has rung with voices tense with indignation and horror. Catholic priests, Anglican clergymen, Protestant ministers of all denominations, laymen of differing political and religious faiths, church councils and committees, all have risen up in spontaneous accord that these pogroms shall end, or else the Jews be rescued *en masse* from the Reich. The conscience of Christendom, in other words, is at last awake. The Jews are not alone. The contempt of them in ignorant and brutal quarters is swept away by such tides of compassion as have not been released in the Christian world since the Armenian massacres, and never before in the history of Israel. We rejoice for Israel that this is true, but equally do we rejoice for Christendom, which is at last redeemed from all charge in this dreadful calamity of indifference

or hostility. Perhaps—who knows!—the time has come when, in rescue of the Jews of Europe, the churches, Catholic and Protestant, will make amends, in part at least, for their ages of persecution!

IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH COMING NEXT?

There is more than a mere suspicion in the surmise that what the Jews are now suffering in Germany at the hands of the Nazis will next fall upon the Roman Catholics. This surmise is based upon the idea that the Jewish persecutions spring not merely from racial hatred and sadistic cruelty; they arise as well from greed of gain and, on the part of the government at least, from a desperate need of funds. It is perfectly plain that the invasion of Austria was primarily a looting expedition. The Vienna banks were promptly emptied, and the Jews robbed of their last sou. The same thing is true of the Czechoslovakian affair in terms not so much of instant cash and treasure as of great industrial properties and abundant raw materials. Now comes this latest and fiercest attack upon the Jews of the Reich, all centered upon the plundering of banks and shops, and the levying of the cash fine of 1,000,000,000 marks. The Nazis are collapsing for lack of funds—there can be no doubt about it! And when the Jews have been stripped of all they have, what can be more natural than that the Nazi chieftains should turn against the Catholics? The treasure in the hands of the Roman church and its devotees is, of course, incalculable. The familiar gold and precious stones, vestments and ecclesiastical adornments, in the cathedrals, monasteries and churches—the private property of priests and of the millions of the faithful in Munich, Vienna, and other Catholic centers—all this would keep a hard-pressed government going for many a long day. Already the groundwork has been laid for an attack upon the hierarchy in all kinds of fantastic stories of wickedness and villainy. The mob assaults upon the bishops' palaces are ominous. At any time now may come an "incident." Then watch for an "uprising," followed by sweeping fines and confiscation of property! Looting is a great game—while it lasts. But there comes an end to this sort of thing. Sooner or later Hitler will come to the last of his and other people's resources. Then will come the crash!

FANTASTIC ARMAMENT PLANS

Seven of the great peace societies of this country have joined in protest to the government against the utterly fantastic and preposterous plans now being put forth for the re-arming of this nation against attack. These plans are compared, in the manifesto of the peace societies, with Orson Welles's "Martian" scare on the radio. Is it possible that the administration is going to try to do with the nation what Welles did with thousands of stupid men and women on that famous broadcast night? It would seem so, judging from statements coming from Washington as to proposals now being considered. Take this suggestion of building 10,000 planes to protect our shores from "bombers" from abroad! In all the world there is not a single aeroplane which could cross three thousand miles of ocean laden with bombs for attack upon ships or cities; and there is not an unladen aeroplane which could make the trip without a landing field for its reception. Who is the crazy loon down there in Washington who envisages clouds of planes overwhelming us after the pattern of European experience? And look at this idea of increasing our army to a million men! What would these million men do with themselves after they were drilled and armed? An administration which plays with proposals of this kind is either hopelessly muddle-headed, or else is scared into a fit of sheer insanity, or else is wickedly plotting to capitalize the dangerous European situation in its own partisan and political interest. It makes little difference, perhaps, which motive is the real one. The fact remains that Washington is planning to throw a war scare into this nation which will knock us stiff, and thus clear the way for the most grandiose armament program in all our history. Now is the time, as the seven peace societies declare, for the people to bestir themselves and organize in opposition to re-arming on this gargantuan scale. When Congress assembles in January there should be a body of public opinion so thoroughly aroused as to make impossible the enactment of such a program as the administration is now contemplating.

THE NEW CHILDHOOD

A queer story comes out of Russia attested by the New York *Times*. It pertains to a boy who discovered that his father was hiding *kulak* peasants who were being seized and deported into Siberia by the government in its campaign for collectivization of the farms. This charming lad told on his father—went to the local Soviet officials and informed them that his father was doing this reprehensible thing! When the father heard that his son had thus betrayed him to the government, he turned on the boy and killed him in a mad fit of anger and alarm. (A delightful revelation, by the way, of the beautiful home life that is enjoyed in Stalin's Russia!) Now, we are told, Moscow is to rear a statue in honor of this juvenile martyr and place it on the sacred ground beneath the Kremlin wall, that all the world, for all time to come, may be reminded of this instance of supreme sacrifice for one's country. This tale, be it said, is by no means unique, except in its sensational *denouement*. For a long time we have known that children in Russia and Germany and Italy have been encouraged to be informants against their parents and other members of the household. Poor Grandma in Leningrad can't sigh for the good old

times, lest four-year old Ivan go trotting 'round to the police station to "snitch" on her. Papa in Berlin can't complain to Mama about the absence of butter from the supper table, for sweet little Gretchen may hear his remarks and tell the nearest storm trooper. As for Antoine in Rome, he can't even snicker over the latest picture of Mussolini in his most swollen mood, without fearing that Tony Junior will disclose the horrid fact to the black-shirted gendarme on the street corner. It must be a lovely atmosphere in which the family gathers around the evening hearth-fire to read or chat together. The children of these totalitarian countries must be winsome little brats. It's a mirthful spectacle—but more a tragic one. For what the dictators are doing to children remains one of the supremely horrifying facts of this horrifying age. We wish these dictators knew the Bible, that we might commend to them *Matthew* 18:6.

DRUNKENNESS

Prohibition, you may remember, was done away with because it increased drunkenness so terribly! The philosophy of repeal was simple—"take liquor away from men, and they will insist on having it; give them liquor in abundance, and they will leave it alone." This never made sense to us, but propaganda put it over, and a "dry" country was made "wet" again. And we were confidently told that drunkenness would now disappear! Well, how has it worked out? Statistics are few, because investigations are few. But now again some figures come along, and they confirm what the eyes of any honest observer clearly see—that drunkenness is now rife among us, worse than ever, and steadily increasing. Thus, a correspondent in the New York *Herald-Tribune* calls attention to the fact that the 1923 census report, section "Prisoners," page 31, table 12, states that in 1923, after Prohibition had been in force for three years, the commitments for drunkenness had declined 55.3 per cent, or more than one-half. On the other hand, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a recent report comparing arrests for 1932 ("dry") and 1937 ("wet"), states that in 1937, after repeal had been in force four years, the per capita increase in arrests for drunkenness was 100.5 per cent, or more than doubled. Our "wet" friends are to be congratulated on their great success in repealing the 18th Amendment and thus getting rid of the evils of liquor. Which is "rit sarkastik," as Artemas Ward used to put it! As a matter of fact, of course, the question of drunkenness and general conditions under Prohibition never came into the minds of the "wets" at all. It was at the very time when Prohibition was at its best, with vastly improved conditions everywhere about us, that the repeal movement was started, and its motive was nothing in the world but the selfish insistence of men used to having their own way, especially in matters of personal indulgence, upon getting their "booze" safely and easily, no matter what the cost to the public welfare. They were going to have their cocktails, no matter what the increase in drunkenness! Now they have got what they want—and the price is being paid. When we have gotten sufficiently tired of paying this price, we shall have Prohibition again!

UNITING CHURCHES IN A DIVIDED WORLD

The churches are freely criticized these days for a lot of faults and failings. All the more, therefore, should they have credit for creditable achievement, and we know few things more creditable than the persistent and patient endeavors of the churches to end their differences, their divisions, and to become one in their service of God and man. The movement toward church unity is remarkable, especially as set and seen against the background of the world these days. This world, or at least a very considerable part of it, is a seething mass of hatreds and hostilities. The nations are eaten up with suspicion and fear of one another, and are arming feverishly in preparation for Armageddon. The races are devoured by prejudice, which seems more poisonous in this age than in any previous age in history. Class struggles and civil wars rage within the nations, and immerse families, communities, countries in floods of discord and destruction. The churches are still divided along familiar lines of theological disputation and ecclesiastical dissension, but these only, among all the institutions of mankind today, seem ashamed of their condition, and resolved to end it. So everywhere the churches are trying to get together. The endeavor begins in single communities, where two, three, or four local churches attempt to merge into a single church, and it reaches up to the great world conference at Utrecht this summer in the interest of a united church of Christ. The record of a decade (1926-1936) in this field, as compiled by H. Paul Douglass in his report entitled, *A Decade of Objective Progress in Church Unity,* presents a remarkable array of figures. Thus, in this single ten-year period, there were fifty-five separate attempts to bring together divided churches (i. e., denominations) into some kind of corporate or federated union, of which twelve have been classified as "conversations," fifteen as "negotiations," thirteen as "rejections and indefinite postponements," and fifteen as "consummations." All told, says Mr. Douglass, "there were more successes than failures, and several of the many failures immediately reappeared as hopeful reactions, sometimes looking to a stronger form of unity than that which had been unsuccessfully pursued." And while all this was going on, the secular world was tearing itself to pieces! All honor to the churches, which may yet save not merely themselves from death, but the world from disintegration.

Jottings

It's high time for Lucifer, Judas, and Brutus to move over down there in Dante's nethermost circle of the Inferno. There must be room for Hitler!

Or why not add a new canto to the Inferno, and place a nether-nethermost circle beneath Dante's lowest round, and there place a new trinity of Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels?

Hitler has been yelling for years in protest to high heaven against the reparations imposed by Versailles upon the Germans, who were only partly guilty of the crime of the Great War alleged against them. Now Hitler himself imposes reparations upon the Jews who are not guilty at all of the crime alleged against *them!* Never again can reparations be cited as an excuse for Nazi horrors.

At last we have discovered that mankind has a conscience, and that this conscience can be shocked into action. We are not quite morally dead, when the world can respond with such a sense of outrage against what is going on in Germany.

And the churches are redeeming themselves! For the first time in history, the Jews have not the contempt but the compassion of Christendom. It may well be that Hitler's orgies are the last death throes of anti-Semitism.

". . . the beast that cometh up out of the abyss shall make war with them and overcome them, and kill them." *Revelation* 11:7.

"The beast that thou sawest was, and is not . . . He goeth into perdition."

Revelation 17:8, 11.

J. H. H.

Fascism, the Jews, and the Pope

ELLEN HÖRUP

A dictator has an advantage over other rulers. Not because he can say one thing today, and the exact opposite tomorrow. Other rulers can do that too. Everything is announced with the same solemnity. Today one thing must be believed, and tomorrow the reverse. Nevertheless, a dictator has the advantage over the others in that his utterances cannot be contradicted. From the moment the words leave his mouth, what he says is dogma, unchallengeable, unanswerable. Other lips are sealed.

For instance, at Mussolini's command, a special Fascist encyclopedia was written, in which the Fascist doctrine is laid down. An article on "Anti-Semitism," written by a Jew, deals with the racial question. We read in this work that "it is necessary first of all to state that, in spite of what may be said to the contrary, there is no Jewish race or type whose physical characteristics are limited solely to the Jewish people. This people is composed, in all its various groups, of a mixture of the same races or characteristics which together form other ethnological European or non-European groups."

This appears in Volume 13. But the clearest and most significant statement is found in Volume 28, in the definition of the conception of race: "There is no Italian race, there is only an Italian people. There is no Jewish race, there is only a Jewish people. There is no Aryan race, there is however an Aryan culture. . . ." In the well-known interview with Emil Ludwig, the historian, in the spring of 1932, we were allowed to hear Mussolini's personal opinion on the subject. Its clearness also leaves nothing to be desired: "Of course, there is no pure race, not even the Jewish race. The strength and beauty of a nation are often due to a happy mixture. A proud nation has no need of race delirium."

That was at a time when Mussolini was not only dictator, but still the only Fascist dictator. In the meantime he has acquired a competitor, and it cannot be denied that he has been outdistanced by his friend Hitler.

In spite of the common basis of Fascism, in spite of the "axis" and the reciprocal triumphal receptions, there is a wound which cannot be healed—the Brenner. In 1934, after the assassination of Dollfuss, Italian troops stood at the Brenner "in order to guarantee the independence of Austria." Today German troops stand there, who greet the Italian frontier guards coolly and superciliously while their eyes look beyond towards the land that Mussolini won by the betrayal of his allies in the Great War. Mussolini's rôle in that betrayal is not forgotten.

Scarcely were the ceremonies in honor of Mussolini over in Berlin, and while Mussolini was still making preparations for the return visit, than Hitler annexed Austria. This was the first defeat suffered by Mussolini in his own country. This cannot be overlooked nor wiped away.

Hitler has already demanded that all those German families living in that part of the Tyrol which was Italy's booty in the World War, who wish to do so, shall be allowed to cross the frontier with all their property. This is the first step. Later will come the turn of the language, the schools, etc. Hitler orders, Mussolini assents. The best proof of this is the anti-Semitism in Italy.

In Mussolini's manifesto against the Jews there is reference to a "physical and particularly moral ideal conception of man, which differentiates him by reason of his purely European features from all non-European races." There is reference also to a "northern-Aryan line," to a "non-European race, bearer of a

European culture, though different from the thousand-year-old Aryan culture." According to the manifesto, the "racial composition of Italy is in broad lines the same today as it was a thousand years ago."

It is not yet a thousand years since the Normans, who were called Germans, settled in this land. And did not Venice, Pisa, Amalfi, Genoa, and, later, Trieste and Livorno pride themselves on being a center for the Orient, which sent them not only merchandise but also their gaily colored collection of peoples? And the Sicilians, with their Greek, Arabian, Albanian, Saracen, and Spanish blood, are they also racially the same as they were a thousand years ago? Can one speak of race at all in a country whose numerous ports were a rendezvous for all the peoples of the earth? Not to mention the theses of the Fascist encyclopedia and Mussolini's own words. Yet now the race must be protected. A manifesto is published, signed by ten illustrious nobodies from the universities, an anti-Semitic organ is started, and the rest follows automatically.

What is the attitude of the Catholic Church towards this development of the axis in Italy? One would have thought that for a Church whose doctrine is Christianity, there would be no choice at all. For it is scarcely compatible with Christ's teaching to work up hatred against a small part of mankind; to despise, persecute, and plunder it, and abandon it to starvation. Not because these people have broken any laws, but because they belong to a race that worships the same God as Christ, from which this Jesus of Nazareth Himself sprang who, in the doctrine of the Catholic Church, is the Son of God.

In a circular letter addressed to the priests of the different parishes, the Vatican repudiates "this new cult, which threatens to lead Christian Europe to the abyss of error and barbarism." The Pope has several times expressed himself against the racial theory. On August 31 of this year he addressed the seminarists who were spending their holidays at the "Propaganda Fide" College in Rome. He warned the young people "to guard against a grave danger: the exaggerated nationalism, which represents a real evil. . . . It is the cause of continual struggles, and even wars. The universality of the Catholic Church does not exclude the ideas of race, nation, and nationality. But mankind, all human people, are one great universal human race. . . . We do not exclude anyone from the human family." Those were fine words, in keeping with the Christian teaching, with humanity, and with justice. It was a protest against what was going on in Germany, and what is now being introduced in Italy. It came from the head of the Catholic Church, whose word is law for millions of people. It awakened hope and found an echo in the whole world press.

But these fine words were like the famous Encyclical of the Pope against Fascism. That also sounded like music, but it was only the hollow sighing of a shell. That Encyclical came when the Pope had known Fascism for years, after he had accepted it and sanctioned it, and allied himself with it by means of the Concordat for a ridiculous sum. When the bargain had been signed and sealed and compliments had been exchanged, then came the Encyclical with its condemnation. This was followed by another convention, which deprived the condemnation of all force.

This time the question at issue is the racial religion. After the Pope had spoken against it several times, the Fascist press reproached the political institution of the Church, the Catholic Action Movement, with being against racial war and therefore against Fascism. The charge was also made that the Movement had misled the Pope with regard to the race question. In his fine speech to the seminarists the Pope replied to this charge:

> It has been said that an unabridgeable gulf has arisen between the Catholic Action Movement and the Fascist Party. Those are grave, but stupid words. For the Catholic Action has no particular doctrine and no particular belief. It has no existence outside the Church. . . . Things must be called by their right names. . . . You have to address yourself to the Church. . . . The Catholic Action cannot be attacked without attacking the Church. . . . Whoever strikes at the Catholic Action strikes at the Pope. And whoever strikes at the Pope, dies.

The Pope and the Catholic Action Movement therefore are one and the same. And the Pope condemns racial war.

While the Pope was speaking more fine words on brotherhood between the people of all races, however, the President of the Catholic Action was having an interview with the General Secretary of the Fascist Party, Starace. Both agreed that all that need be done was to bring the Convention of September 1931 out again. By this Convention, after his condemnation of Fascism, the Pope had to undertake that the Catholic Action would not concern itself with politics.

The *Osservatore Romano* publishes the text and adds that "the other points at issue concerning the relation between the Fascist Party and the Catholic Action would soon be settled." It was further pointed out that there was nothing incompatible in belonging to the Catholic Action and the Fascist Party at the same time; this would facilitate the settlement of future differences.

But how can differences be settled if the Fascists do not desist from persecution of the Jews? And how can the Pope allow Catholics to remain Fascists, if the Fascists are against the Pope, who regards the Jews as his brethren? Does it improve things if the Pope declares that the problem is not political but religious, and says that he is in agreement with the Fascists, who hold opposite views?

The real gist of the matter comes out clearly in the Italian press. The *Osservatore Romano* reports that on August 27 the Pope received the pilgrims from Bergamo and Brescia. Among the pilgrims from the former town were prominent Catholics who had recently been subjected to Fascist chicanery and persecution. The Pope told the pilgrims from Bergamo "that he was aware of all that they, their leaders and bishops, had had to endure recently. Nevertheless, he was confident that all these things would cease from now onwards, to the honor of both sides, in accordance with the promise that had been given him."

What could this promise have been?

On the same day that the Pope reassured the pilgrims from Bergamo, Farinacci in his paper *Regime Fascista* boasted of the thrashing that the Fascists had administered to a priest in Ascoli Picena. "He got what he needed. Let it be a lesson to him." Farinacci is Mussolini's right hand. In his hatred of the Jews, he is almost a Streicher. In answer to a Catholic journal in Cremona which expressed surprise that he could be a Catholic and at the same time attack the Pope, he said: "The journal asks how it is that we belong to the Catholic faith without accepting all that

comes from the mouth of the Pope, his Cardinals, and Bishops as pure gold. We reply, that in politics we recognize only one chief, the Duce—and our conscience."

It is not easy for the good Catholics, who have on the one hand to obey the Pope and oppose racial war, and on the other to obey Mussolini and accept racial war. Not only that, but both acts must accord with their conscience. It is far easier for Farinacci. But the conscience of the good Catholics can scarcely be any better than his.

Nor is it an easy matter to defend this nonsense. At a meeting in Cours, France, a Canon Clavel gave a lecture followed by a discussion on the Church and Fascism. According to a report by the Catholic paper *La Croix* (July 25, 1938) he demonstrated that every totalitarian State is in conflict with one of the essential points of the Church doctrine, human personality. Whereas the totalitarian State regards the individual as an instrument, the Church teaches that it is not the person that must serve the State, but vice-versa, that the State is there for the person's sake. "The Church and Fascism are separated by a great gulf." One of the opponents asked why then Italian bishops had blessed the ships and weapons for the Ethiopian campaign. Clavel had no other explanation than that, in a country under Fascist government, where the whole press is controlled by the State, it was difficult even for the bishops to judge and to act rightly. He further pointed out "how strongly Pius XI had condemned the unjust war of conquest." The Pope and the Italian bishops believe then that Mussolini's murderous war against Ethiopia was neither a war of conquest, nor an unjust war! The same opponent drew attention to the fact that the Pope had recognized Franco. Clavel answered that the Concordat did not necessarily mean a sanctioning of the system of government, and the Church could send her ambassadors where she liked.

The Pope may complain of Fascism, which forbids him and his Catholic Action to concern themselves with what he designates as religious, but Mussolini as political, matters. Yet he must admit that he is now only lying on the bed he himself has made: the reactionary Catholic Church has from the outset supported Fascism.

The former chief editor of the *Corriere della Sera*, Alberto Tarchiani, wrote in *La Giovane Italia* (August 6, 1938):

> Pius XI has sanctioned many injustices. He has sanctioned the violation of laws and treaties, as well as conquest by arms, so long as they were successful. He has recognized Franco and surrounded him with fatherly love, while the latter, in the name of the Catholic faith and Christian charity, assassinated old people, women, and children, because they were guilty of the crime of living in open towns and refusing to become Fascists.
>
> How much injustice, shame and blood have passed over the tired, old head of the Pope!

Do Tarchiani's words need further corroboration? The members of the Eucharist Congress received it—at any rate proof of the Church's relation to Spain. This Congress was transformed into a parade of priests in uniform and red caps, in honor of Franco's delegation, with Cardinal Goma at its head. Under the chairmanship of the Jesuits, every meeting began with a presentation of the rebel delegates and their South American friends. Pictures of Franco were exhibited, surrounded by the rebel flags bearing in their center the bleeding heart of Christ.

Another delegation also attended this Congress. In spite of Hitler's prohibition, 350 German priests sent their delegates, in order to set before the Congress the complaints of the German Catholic Church. "We are ready to suffer and to die for our faith," they said. "We have come to ask our Christian brothers for help." They found no brothers there. They saw Cardinal Goma give the Fascist salute and heard the South American bishops cry "Long live Franco!"

Though in regard to the race war, it occurs to the Pope that "we are all brothers," it must, nevertheless, be pointed out that he has ignored this fact too long.

What, for instance, was the attitude of the Church towards those brothers who were struck down by the Fascists without trial and without law only because they were in opposition to the Party,—which the Pope himself in his Encyclical qualified as "a disgrace to our people." The Pope, the Catholic Action, and the entire priesthood were silent. After the Concordat was signed, the first thought of the Pope was to take proceedings against those priests who had left the Church and had married. The head of the whole brotherhood of mankind demanded that all those ex-priests who were in the service of the State should be dismissed. On that occasion even Mussolini was more human. He refused. Yet he is only the brother of his Fascists.

When the Ethiopian campaign started were not all the church bells rung out of sympathy for this undertaking? And when the victory over the unarmed people was announced, did not the Church give thanks to God that He had helped to murder the defenseless? *Te deum laudamus* rang out in all the churches. "God's messenger" had made Italy into an Empire. So much for the Pope's Ethiopian brothers in Christ!

And what about Austria? Was not the first to prepare the ground for Fascism a Catholic priest, the representative of the Pope, Monseigneur Seipel? And Dollfuss, the chosen son of the Church—did he not order the workers to be shot down, so as to sweep away the only hindrance to Fascism? Was it not good Austrian Nazism that Schuschnigg took over and carried a stage further? All of them smoothed the way for Hitler with Fascist methods and reaction, just as Herr von Papen did in Germany, and every one of them did so with the blessing of the Pope.

The Pope always speaks against racial war. He shows the Italians, who are all Catholics, the way to "brotherhood, the great human family, in which there is no place for separate races and from which no one is excluded." And Mussolini shows the Italians, who are all Fascists, the way in the opposite direction. He dismisses the Jewish scholars, and prohibits all Jewish children attending the State schools. The Jews who had acquired civil rights after 1919 lose these rights automatically. Refugees who have come into the country in the course of the last twenty years are expelled. Well-known professors, personal friends of Mussolini, amongst others the Admiral of the Majorca fleet, have all been expelled.

It is impossible to reconcile Mussolini's Fascism and the Pope's Fascism in this racial war. The war will be intensified, and the Pope will have to retreat. In the struggle against the Church, Mussolini and his Fascism are bound to win. For he at any rate has followed one line of action and knows what he wants. The Pope, on the other hand, follows the traditional Vatican policy, the policy of the lesser evil, which is the absolute negation of the idea of justice.

Symbols, Myths, and Underlying Realities

VICTOR S. YARROS

Prof. Thurman W. Arnold, of the Yale University Law school, now of the United States Department of Justice as assistant Attorney General, has caused much perplexity, as well as irritation, by his two little volumes on the burning and complex problem of the day: *Symbols of Government* and *The Folklore of Capitalism.* In the United States Senate his nomination by the President for a position that was understood to involve determined and earnest litigation under the Sherman and Clayton anti-monopoly laws met with considerable opposition from persons who apparently had found his books too paradoxical or too cynical or too subtle and clever for their taste, and who would have preferred an old-style trust-boosting lawyer whose arguments the man on the street can understand, and who uses few ifs, buts, perhapses, and similar reservations.

The conventional economists and sociologists likewise are puzzled by Mr. Arnold. They are unable to tag him, to associate him with any "ism," to indict him upon definite charges. Most of the reviewers in the magazines and newspapers have praised his books and found them challenging, stimulating, keen, eye-opening, and refreshing. He has been called a modern Voltaire, a deadly foe of cant, humbug, and pompous nonsense. He punctures fallacies and dispels verbal fogs with remarkable skill. He is never bitter, violent, offensive. He says startling, revolutionary things in a quiet and cool manner.

Only one noted reviewer, of the New York *Times* staff, accuses him of unfairness, of misrepresentation, of shiftiness, of imprecision, and even of a sneaking admiration for Hitlerism and dictatorships. Mr. Arnold hastened to repudiate the allegation that he sympathizes with the ways and methods of the modern tyrants and barbarians, but, as we shall see, he is not without *some* responsibility for the damaging misinterpretation of his position by the hostile critic in question. He is a satirist, and inordinately fond of irony and caricature; this leads him, occasionally, to exaggeration or question-begging. In other words, he is not without some of the defects of his remarkable qualities. But of deliberate intellectual dishonesty he cannot be, and has not been, convicted by any critic or opponent.

Moreover, Mr. Arnold is not without positive and constructive ideas. He destroys in order to build. He is desirous of removing rubbish and nuisances, of clearing the ground for intelligent and beneficial social action. He may be called a realist and a pragmatist, though he gives no credit to the philosophers of Pragmatism—Peirce, Dewey, James—whom he must have read. He offers no program or platform, and he certainly has little patience with the Utopian thinkers, past or present. His position as a practical student of government, law, and economics is nowhere satisfactorily stated, but it is not difficult to perceive the trend of his thought from such observations and comments as the following:

> Names and phobias are preventing the practical appraisals of a situation and the adoption of measures clearly necessary. Yet this is the essential duty of democratic governments.
>
> Preconceived principles are considered more important than practical results, and the practical alleviation of human distress and the distribution of available comforts is paralyzed.
>
> We must pay more attention to facts than to principles inherited from the past. We must forget theory and logic, and recognize that it is desirable and possible that the great productive machine of the country shall produce and distribute goods as rapidly as possible. . . . We must experiment, and learn from mistakes and successes alike. Dogmas must not stand in the way.
>
> Government need not be, and never has been, consistent, logical, rational.

Such utterances as these, especially when torn from their respective contexts, lend themselves to grievous misinterpretation. They seem to repudiate *all* first principles, to deny the need of *any* theory as a guide to the practice of statesmen and industrialists. Mr. Arnold cannot possibly go as far as that. He rightly objects to uncritical acceptance of *dogmas* in politics and economics, since science, even inexact science, has no dogmas. He objects, too, to blind adherence to principles laid down under conditions radically different from those which exist today. He demands *new* guiding principles, not leaps in the dark, mere venturing or improvising under the prompting of good intentions.

For example: Mr. Arnold rejects the *laissez-faire* principle not because it is a principle, or because it was inherited from the days of Adam Smith and his disciples, but because that principle is not valid today and was not intended to apply to a situation like ours. The classical economists made certain assumptions. Those assumptions were not fully warranted even at the time they were first made, but they *seemed* warranted by the trends and tendencies of the period. Today the same assumptions cannot be made without outraging common sense and the sense of reality and fact. They are simply absurd. *Laissez-faire,* therefore, has become "irrelevant, incompetent, and immaterial," as the lawyers say. We require new principles, new theories, new interpretations of economic and social data.

The trouble with the reactionaries and tories of today is not that they are consistent, logical, and theoretical, but that they are unable or unwilling to face the fact that their conclusions are drawn from premises that no longer represent actual situations and conditions. Consistency and logic do not preclude careful restudy and revision of premises. The logicians who are led to patent absurdities are *not* "too logical"; they err in overlooking certain facts, or in giving some facts insufficient weight and overemphasizing other facts.

Thus our rugged individualists and liberty-leaguers are not too logical. What they forget, or have never learned, is the fact that they owe their advantages, privileges, and possessions not to the principles and spirit of liberty, which they protest they want to preserve, but to *violations* of liberty, to unfair practices, to vicious statutes, to "the communism of pelf." They are not opposed to paternalism; they are opposed to paternalism in the interest of farmers or wageworkers. Paternalism for their own benefit they welcomed and still welcome. The New Deal is paternalistic, because the old deal was paternalistic. Government cannot cease to interfere with industry and trade just because the "haves" no longer control it, and today such interference often spells loss of ill-gotten gains.

This brings us to Mr. Arnold's positive and constructive hints. Just where does he stand politically? The answer may be gathered, again, from certain scattered passages:

> The writer has faith that a new public attitude

toward the ideals of law and government is slowly appearing to create an atmosphere where the fanatical alignment between opposing political principles may disappear as a competent, practical, opportunistic governing class may rise to power.

The fundamental social axiom of the past was that man, by working only for his personal profit, in the long run produced the most ideal social results. The formula of the new social philosophy may be the fundamental axiom that man works only for his fellow man. This tendency may be curbed, just as the other has had to be curbed by law, religion and ethics. But only incidental room will be needed for the profit-seeker.

If government can do things better than private or corporate business, let it do them. The fear that liberty will perish is irrational. For millions, liberty *has* perished; for others, it is a name for ill-gotten gains.

It is a good thing to make people comfortable if the means exist by which this can be done. We worry about the morals and character of the destitute, and neglect their immediate needs. We do not this in hospitals or asylums.

Clearly, Mr. Arnold expects radical changes in the direction of what may be called Collectivism. He believes in making people comfortable, in attending to immediate needs, in first things first, in being governed by human sympathy and good sense. His reference to hospitals and asylums is significant. Our society is *sick;* our economic system has broken down; the victims—the unemployed, the destitute, the underpaid and overworked men, women, and children—cannot live or improve their position by singing patriotic songs, celebrating the victories of the past, reading the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We must give them food, shelter, fuel, medical aid, books, and amusements. In addition, we must seek permanent solutions of the problems facing us, and take the steps now necessary or expedient, and not worry about future dangers. Sufficient unto the day are the evils thereof. For example, the notion that, if we take over the railroads and operate them under government auspices for the benefit of the country, we commit ourselves to full-fledged Socialism, or even Communism, is silly. The regulation of wages and hours does *not* involve the regulation of our thinking and writing. Planning does *not* spell slavery and bureaucracy. We are free to stop where wisdom counsels stopping. We are not afraid of "politicians," because we have engineers, men of science, accountants, and other experts to guide us. The government can use brains and experience quite as well as, if not better than, corporations owned by many and actually controlled by small cliques, often selfish, arrogant, and predatory.

If these are the views of Mr. Arnold, then, to repeat, he is a very excellent progressive and constructive radical.

There is, however, an important criticism to which his style and manner lay him open. In all his attacks on sacred cows, on mere slogans and dogmas, on the subordination of human beings to vague abstractions, he fails to recognize *adequately* and *expressly* the rôle played by vested interests, by economic factors, by class habits, and by wishful thinking. As Prof. Harold Laski puts it, those "who live differently think differently." Deliberate hypocrisy and intellectual fraud are not as common in politics and contests over social and economic measures as many imagine. The wealthy liberty-leaguers really *believe* that they are fighting for sound Americanism and for genuine Individualism. No group demands favors of the government without believing that these favors will benefit the whole nation —witness the Protectionists, the Subsidy-Seekers, the Big Navy agitators. We are so constituted that we actually *require* high-sounding slogans for the promotion of our personal interests. And as the former Dean of St. Paul's cathedral, in London, once said: "Individuals may rise above their class interests and their class prejudices; but whole classes never do." The classes are not consciously selfish; they believe they are right. But the United States has not escaped the class struggle, and it could not escape such conflict after the exhaustion of free land and the monopolization of the national resources.

Mr. Arnold need not swallow the Marxian formulas, but earnest consideration of the rôle of economic interests and class sympathies and antipathies would have rendered his analysis more realistic, and less *seemingly* paradoxical than it now is. His position is impregnable, but he unfortunately gives the impression of being skeptical and negative, if not whimsically perverse.

Israel's Training in Hardship*

HENRY M. SIMMONS

When Sir Marcus Samuel was inaugurated Lord Mayor of London, the words of the telegram from that city, telling us of the notable event, were that the procession was "more brilliant than usual" and that, "for the first time in the history of London," it "traversed the heart of the Ghetto, in recognition of the Jewish ancestry" of this highest official; while "Jewish London especially celebrated the event, and the poorest inhabitants of Whitechapel and Houndsditch were banquetted at the expense of their wealthier" brethren. This and varied kindred triumphs move me to write of that strong people, who have held so important a place in the history of religion, who have seen the rise and survived the fall of Greece and Rome and so many human governments—and who, after 2500 years of humiliation and threatened annihilation, have been in our own times coming forward with all the vigor of youth, and with even more, so that in the very nations where they have been most despised, they have been rising above their rivals and pushing into places of highest influence and power. There is no other nation that has brought so much out of so little.

Even in the ancient and most prosperous days of the nation, it seemed of no account, among the great powers of the world. Its territory was insignificant and its people repeatedly the prey of neighboring nations. Its government showed no stability. The kingdom was no sooner established under David and Solomon, than it was rent in two and never again reunited. Neither of the two rival kingdoms ever attained to any power; but they often tried even to destroy each other, and were both soon destroyed by the great nations of the Euphrates valley, and the best of the people carried there as captives. Some of these afterwards returned, and tried to reëstablish the nation; but only to be subject in turn to Persian, Greek, and Roman rule, with no

*Dr. Simmons was for many years the revered minister of the Unitarian church in Minneapolis. This learned paper is as valuable today as when it was written.—*Editor.*

independence except a partial one under the Maccabees. Many of the people became scattered through the world; and those who remained in Palestine, though defending their land with a courage and endurance never surpassed, were soon conquered completely and well-nigh exterminated by the Roman Titus, their sacred Jerusalem destroyed and its holy temple burned. It was the year 70 of our era; and it was evident that the world had now seen the last of them and their religion.

Hardly ever in history were a people more thoroughly conquered; yet never in history did a people remain so unconquered and obtain so thorough a victory over its conquerors. Not only did those Jews who had been dispersed through the world still preserve amid foreign nations their own laws, institutions, religion, peculiarities of every kind; not only did Jewish ideas and life enter largely into the religion of Mohammed to survive for all these centuries among all the millions of Moslems, but that very Palestine which the Romans conquered, that very Jerusalem which the Romans destroyed, soon conquered the Roman Empire, soon conquered vast peoples beyond whom the Romans could not, conquered this Western hemisphere which the Romans never knew, so that today, so many centuries after, and through America, so many thousands of miles away, the Jewish Psalms sung in that old temple at Jerusalem are still sung in all the churches as the very highest worship; the Jewish Jehovah to whom that temple was built is praised by all Christians as the one God Almighty; the words of Jewish prophets and Jewish apostles are read every Sunday as the very words of God; a portion of the literature of the Jews is praised by Christian preachers as the one and only revelation of God; while the great Roman Catholic Church even adores and almost deifies a Jewish woman, calling her the "mother of God"; and the entire Church, Catholic and Protestant alike, wholly deifies the son of that Jewish woman as the one and only begotten son of God, and as omnipotent God himself. So thoroughly did those conquered Jews conquer their conquerors and all Christendom! And to make the triumph all the greater, the Jews themselves saw nothing to honor in this Jewess and her son. They saw him as in general a teacher of their own old religious precepts, and, so far as he taught different ones, as a leader not to be allowed, but to be opposed, as the leaders of new religious movements always are. And when the new Church raised his name to honors higher and even higher, the Jews did not try to gain any glory from him, but stoutly and steadfastly refused to join in this growing movement of the Gentile world to deify a native of their own Palestine and son of their own nation.

Dr. Hosmer, in his *History of the Jews,* tells all this finely, and pictures the conquered and prostrate Jew as proudly saying to the great Gentile world that conquered him: "Yield to me . . . Dash in pieces your altars," whence the "smoke of sacrifice has ascended for ages"; end every "libation and augury"; dismiss all your old religion and Gods "as false"; "take from me a faith which shall last you for ages . . . Accept Jehovah, my God, as the only God. Accept my race as the chosen race; accept its literature as sacred and infallible. Reverence my land as a holy land. Accept a man of my race, not only as the Redeemer of the world, but the incarnate God himself. That your subjection may be the more marked and utter, this Galilean whom I force you to receive as Lord and Saviour, I myself will utterly reject and contemn, requiring you to reverence what I despise as folly and superstition."

But this conquest of Christendom by the Jewish Jehovah, the Jewish Scripture, and a Jewish woman and her son did not at all help the Jews themselves, but brought them new humiliations and oppressions. Christendom, instead of showing them gratitude for the Bible and the God and the Virgin and the Messiah which they had given to it, began to persecute them. As early as 414 A. D. the Christian Patriarch of Alexandria, the very Cyril who led the movement to call that Jewess "the Mother of God, treated the Jews without mercy, and, as Gibbon says, at the dawn of day, led a seditious multitude to the attack of their synagogues," leveled them with the ground, and, "after rewarding the troops with the plunder of their goods, expelled from the city" all those people who had been allowed there some 600 years under pagan rule, and had multiplied to 40,000. Such persecutions continued down to the time of the crusades, and then greatly increased and became very common. For the crusaders said: Why march to distant Palestine to recover the mere grave of Christ and leave unmolested these Jews who crucified Christ? This was indeed the chief charge against these persecuted people—that they had crucified Christ! To see how false was the charge, we have only to remember that most of them were descended from men who had left Palestine long before it, and that even in Palestine at the time of the crucifixion but a very small part of the Jews had anything to do with it. To blame the Jews for the crucifixion of Jesus is no more just than it would be to blame the whole American people of the last fifty years and of all time to come for the hanging of John Brown. Indeed, it is far less just, for crucifixion is not a Jewish custom at all, and the worst that could be said against the Jews is that perhaps a small party of them, headed by a few priests, brought about the crucifixion of Jesus by the Roman rulers. Yet under this charge they were persecuted all through Christendom, and especially in the time of those Holy crusades.

Dean Milman, himself a Christian clergyman, tells for instance how at Treves "the crusaders rushed to the city, and began a relentless pillage, violation, and massacre of every Jew they could find," so that "men were seen to slay their own children to save them from the worse usage of these savages," women, having deliberately tied stones around themselves that they might sink, plunged from the bridge to save their honor and escape baptism." He says such scenes were repeated in various cities, that "everywhere the tracks of the crusaders were deeply marked by Jewish blood," and that the monkish historians coolly tell of these barbarities as if they were not at all to be blamed. Indeed, the monks and clergy often incited the persecutions; and though some, like St. Bernard, sought to stop them, and though Dean Milman says, in words which Protestants should remember, that "of all European sovereigns, the Popes, with some exceptions, have pursued the most generous policy toward the Jews," still, he says, "the power of the clergy no doubt tended greatly to increase the general detestation against the unhappy Jew."

Think how in most Christian France the persecution of the Jews was considered an especially sacred duty! At Bezieres, for instance, where Jews abounded, Hallam says they were regularly stoned in Holy Week, between Palm Sunday and Easter, and that the Christian populace were incited to it by a sermon. Dean Mil-

man also tells of this, and gives part of one of the sermons. Said the preacher:

> You have around you those who crucified the Messiah, who deny Mary, the Mother of God. Now [in this holy week] is the time when you should feel most deeply the iniquity of which Christ was the victim. . . . Like your pious ancestors, hurl stones at them, and show your sense of his wrongs by the vigour with which you resist them.

Such was the sermon, and I dare say that for once the sermon was heeded. And so proper did this practice seem that the bishop who stopped it was accused of being bribed. Their property rights were so little respected that King Philip Augustus issued "an edict which confiscated all debts due to the Jews"; and even the good King St. Louis annulled one-third of such debts, and did it, he said, "for the welfare of his soul and the souls of his father and ancestors." They were several times banished from France, often burned, and an old chronicle says that on a single pile at Chinon, "160 of both sexes were burned together." In Spain, their condition was still worse, if possible, and we read of 4000 being murdered one year at Seville in a massacre led by a Christian preacher; while at the famous expulsion under Torquemada, some half a million left, rather than abandon their faith, and had to leave their loved property behind too. Even in England they were not treated much better. At the coronation of Richard I, 500 are said to have been massacred at York alone, and Dean Milman says that one English king "actually sold or mortgaged to his brother all the Jews in the realm (for 5000 marks) giving him power over their property and persons, and the English records still preserve the terms of this extraordinary bargain." He says, too, that the "Church was their most implacable enemy" there; that the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Lincoln forbade all Christians from selling them the necessaries of life; and that in 1286 the Bishop of London ordered all the Jewish synagogues there to be leveled to the ground. Four years after, in 1290, all the Jews were expelled from England, some 15,000 of them, and all their property confiscated. Among other events of this expulsion, Hollinshed tells how a captain, who was to take a number of them away, purposely left them on the shore at the mouth of the Thames, to be swallowed by the rising tide, and that when they prayed to him for help, he ordered them to pray to Moses who helped their fathers through the Red Sea; and that for thus drowning them the captain was thanked and rewarded by the king. And so the Jews were all driven out of England, and kept out some 350 years until Cromwell's time, although it is said that a few were generally tolerated there as physicians or in other important places at court, where England could not get along without them, for through this period of their persecution, many Jews were often the foremost persons in Europe in medicine and various fields of learning.

Of course they had their faults. Being shut from many occupations and driven to trade and finance, they made the most of it, and were doubtless greedy and grasping, often charging rates of interest ranging from 25 to 40 per cent. But it was worth that, for the Jew was not always able to collect his interest, or even get the principal back; and often when he did, it was taken from him by some king or noble in need of money. For such men had learned to use the Jews as a convenient sponge, to absorb the wealth of the community, and then squeeze it into their treasuries—and sometimes squeeze the Jews to death in doing so. Even the holy Saint Thomas Aquinas once told the Duchess of Brabant that it was quite proper to take from the Jews all the property they had gained by usury, to be restored to those who paid the usury, or to be used for some pious purpose, and the pious purpose was often the persecution of the Jews. Doubtless, too, the Jews hated the Christians, and had good reason to; but they showed few actual crimes against them. That frequent story of their stealing a Christian child and crucifying him at the paschal feast, though told in thousands of times and places even down to our own day, has again and again been investigated without the slightest proof that it was true in one of the cases, and even if it had been true in all of them, it would be but a trifle compared with the known massacres of Jews by Christians. Altogether the Jews seem to have been much the better Christians of the two. As Browning, who left so many good lines in favor of the Jews, told it in his poem on that Holy Cross Day when the Jews in Rome were forced to go and listen to a Christian sermon, he makes Rabbi Ben Ezra claim that they are the truer Christians, and makes him say to Christ:

> Thine, too, is our cause, and not at all thine
> Is the work of these Christian dogs and swine,
> Whose life laughs through and spits at their creed,
> Who maintain thee in word and deny thee in deed . . .
> By our torture prolonged from age to age,
> By our infamy, Israel's heritage,
> By the Ghetto's plague, by the garb's disgrace,
> By the badge of shame, by the felon's place,
> By the branding-tool, the bloody whip,
> And the summons to Christian fellowship,
> We boast our proofs that at least the Jew
> Would save Christ's name from this devil's crew.

Nor will it do to lay all the blame on Rome, and the Catholics, but the Protestants will have to take their share of it. Luther himself has left some 400 pages against the Jews—pages, says Milman, "mostly of bitter vituperation" and "most painful to read." We often see printed a quotation from Luther, bidding Christians take away from the Jews their prayer books and Talmuds, and burn their synagogues and schools; and whether this is correctly quoted or not, you may at any rate read in Luther's own Table-Talk, his advice that a converted Jew should be baptized "quite under water"; while of one only pretending to be converted in order to escape persecution, he says, "I would take him unto the bridge, tie a stone around his neck, and hurl him into the river." And it was long after Luther before Protestant lands showed any favor to the Jews. Says Lecky:

> Certainly the heroism of the defenders of every other creed fades into insignificance before this martyr people, who for thirteen centuries confronted all the evils that the fiercest fanaticism could devise, enduring obloquy and spoliation, the violation of the dearest ties, and the infliction of the most hideous sufferings, rather than abandon their faith.

It is interesting, too, to notice how the Jew was treated in the popular literature of Christendom. One of the stories that came down from ancient times, and had at least eleven versions in the early literature of Europe, was that of some man bargaining to forfeit to his creditor a certain weight of his own flesh. The wicked creditor who would accept such a settlement was at first not a Jew, but very naturally he soon came to be, and so figures in more than half of these stories. An old poem of the thirteenth century, 300 years before Shakespeare (Cursor Mundi), tells how a Christian goldsmith in Constantine's time, owing money to a Jew, promised, if it was not paid at a certain date, to give instead its weight of his own flesh, and was going to

be obliged to do it, when the judge decided that no drop of blood could be given with it, and so the Jew was punished by losing not only his debt, but all his property and his tongue besides. But a much more full and familiar version of the story is that written by Ser Giovanni Fiorentino, a century later, but still more than 200 years before Shakespeare wrote. I have on my shelves the work of this author in the original Italian, and this story of the Jew is very interesting. It tells how a certain merchant of Venice, in order to fit out his grandson to go and woo a lady in Belmonte, borrowed 10,000 ducats from a Jew, with the condition that if it was not paid at the promised time, the Jew might take a pound of flesh from any part of the merchant's body, as he might choose. The son, after various experiences, wins his bride and comes back to find his grandfather unable to pay, and the Jew demanding the flesh, and refusing to settle on any other terms; no, not for all the gold that Venice is worth. But just at the proper time the bride also appears from Belmonte disguised as a lawyer, and when the Jew, razor in hand, is about to begin his operation, she tells him that if he takes either more or less than his pound, or sheds a drop of blood in doing it, he shall be put to death. So the Jew accepts the situation, and loses his debt, but is not otherwise punished.

Such was the Jew whom Shakespeare, 200 years after, made into his Shylock, and combined with still another story in his *Merchant of Venice*. As we might expect, he makes the Jew into a much stronger character, and makes him defend his nation well, and show up the faults of the Christians well. "Hath not a Jew eyes, organs, senses, affections, passions, . . . hurt with the same weapons as a Christian is? If you prick us do we not bleed? . . . and if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If a Jew wrong a Christian, what is the Christian's humility? Revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by Christian example? Why, Revenge. The villainy you teach me I will execute." In various other passages of the play, Shakespease shows the faults of the Christians—from that Christian merchant who had kicked the Jew and spit upon him, and will do it again, to the Jewess Jessica, who signalizes her conversion to Christianity by at once stealing her father's wealth and beginning her Christian life with a crime. Indeed, this is so evident that some critics think the play is partly a satire on Christian customs, and Conway suggested that Shylock is a sort of mirror to show the Christians their own faults. But with all his strength, Shylock is still a mean man, and Shakespeare evidently despises him. His fundamental quality is avarice, so extreme that it conquers even his love for his daughter. He dreams of his money-bags, and his last charge to her is to take care of them; when she runs away with them, he mourns for his "ducats and his daughter," and thinks so much more of them than of her that he wishes she were dead at his feet and the jewels in her ear. When he hears that she is squandering them, he sinks to the depths of sorrow, and says "the curse never fell upon our nation till now"; and at the last, in order to keep half of his property, the great Shylock meekly submits to his humiliation and is converted and says he is "content" even to become a Christian. No, Shakespeare makes his Jew a mean man after all, and ignores all the tens of thousands of them who had lost all their property, and their lives, too, rather than become Christian.

But to see the more common conception of the Jews, even in English literature, we should turn to the play of Shakespeare's contemporary, Christopher Marlowe. Marlowe's *Jew of Malta,* Barabas, fills a whole play with crime, strangles one friar and gets another hung for it; blows up an army; betrays one ruler into the hands of another, and then turns about and betrays the other; incites the lovers of his daughter to kill each other, and is himself ready to kill her; poisons a whole nunnery for the sake of poisoning his own daughter, and then enjoys the bells which toll their death, as he never had before:

> "There is no music like a Christian's knell;
> How sweet the bells ring, now the nuns are dead,
> That sound at other times like tinkers' pans."

That is more like the popular conception of the Jew, even so late as Shakespeare's time.

But little by little the world has been learning how false it was. That hatred of their own daughters is peculiarly false, for they have been preëminently domestic and devoted to their children. That hatred of Christians was something which the Christians themselves had caused. Even that avarice had not kept them from being foremost in the higher fields of life. Even amid their persecutions, says Lecky:

> the genius of that wonderful people rose supreme. While those around them were grovelling in the darkness of besotted ignorance; while juggling miracles and lying relics were the themes on which almost all Europe was expatiating; while the intellect of Christendom enthralled by countless superstitions, had sunk into a deadly torpor, in which all love for inquiry and all search for truth were abandoned, the Jews were still pursuing the path of knowledge, amassing learning, and stimulating progress, with the same unflinching consistency that they had manifested in their faith. They were the most skillful physicians, the ablest financiers, and among the most profound philosophers; while they were only second to the Moors in the cultivation of natural science.

Of course this praise of Lecky only applies to a part of them. The great mass of them were doubtless low and mean and bad enough, for their long centuries of oppression had made them so and kept them so. But they have been peculiar as a nation which, from its general expanse of low level, has been sending up its higher rings of humanity and here and there its lofty mountain peaks, in towering intellects or characters. Such were the great prophets of the eighth century B. C., such the Second Isaiah in the time of the Captivity, and such Jesus and Paul in the first century of our era, men of their nation, yet rising so far above it as to be more or less rejected by it. Such, in the very generation after Shakespeare presented Shylock, was that Spinoza, who so belied him, one of the greatest of human philosophers, and one of the saintliest and most beautiful characters in history. Read the interesting sketch of him in Dr. Hosmer's book. Read in the same book the story of that great Jew of the next century, Moses Mendelsohn, the son of Mendell, ancestor of the more famous musician, Mendelsohn, yet with a soul still more musical, a poor hunchback in body, but one of the most erect and largest and loftiest spirits of all time. So large indeed was he that he refused to oppose other religions, or even to argue for his own, but said he would defend it by virtue rather than controversy, and did not want to extend it at all, since no men needed to be converted to any foreign or formal religion, but all who followed "the religion of nature and of reason" were "the children of eternal salvation." This was an idea so advanced and strange at that time that the world wondered when Lessing presented it in that great *Nathan the Wise,* and other dramas and writings which were the first modern literary works to do justice to the Jews; yet that lofty and ideal character of Nathan, the Jew, was no nobler, but very much like this

real and living Jew, Lessing's own friend and inspirer, Moses Mendelsohn.

All these Jews whom I have mentioned, and hundreds of other noble ones, arose while their people were still suffering their old humiliation and were deprived of their civil rights through all Christendom. But still more frequently have they been coming to the front in the last century, since they have been more or less emancipated in various nations of Europe. They are not half emancipated yet, and more than half the Hebrew race are said to be contained in Russia and Roumania, where they have no rights to speak of. Yet how they have been showing their genius and ability, in art and literature and science! Think of their famous musicians, those Mendelsohns, Meyerbeer, Moscheles, Halevy, Rubinstein, Joachim. In acting, as Lecky says, a "Jewess is the most popular tragic actress on the contemporary stage, and another Jewess is probably the greatest tragic actress of the century." So in literature and the sciences, their names greet us frequently among authors and professors. Even in political power they have been rising in those nations that used to persecute them. Said George Eliot in 1879:

> At this moment the leader of the liberal party in Germany is a Jew, the leader of the Republican party in France is a Jew, and the head of the conservative ministry in England is a Jew. And below this British prime minister, Disraeli, and the German, Lasker, and the French, Gambetta, so great as an orator and political leader, have been other influential Jews, so many as to frighten the nations that used to despise them.

France was almost thrown into a panic by a handful of Jews in its population, and a correspondent illustrated their advance to office in Germany by a coroner's inquest, where, he said, the coroner and doctors and experts and in fact all the important persons present were Jews, except the corpse. Of their general advance, hear a few sentences from those articles in the *Revue de Deux Mondes,* by the eminent M. Leroy-Beaulieu. Said he:

> We count few generations since, at the signal of France, have fallen the black walls of the Ghetto and the bolted gates of the Juden-gasse; and already a great number of Jews, of France, Germany, Austria, England, Italy, even Russia, not content with establishing themselves in the streets of our cities, have invaded the chairs of our universities, the stage of our theaters, even the tribune of our political assemblies. Outside of France, and of Holland, it is not a century that this pariah has been emancipated; and in every country where he has obtained equality of rights, this little Jew, yesterday shut up in his Ghetto, does not content himself with reigning on the Bourse, he competes with us on our own ground, in what was to him most strange, in the arts and sciences the most modern. In all domains this newcomer of Israel has shown himself of force to war with the Christian, with the Aryan. The Jews may be in very small minority—one or two in a hundred, sometimes, as in France or in Italy, one or two in a thousand—yet in almost all careers, some have raised themselves to the first rank.

Nor does this author limit the power to conspicuous Jews, but sees it everywhere in the nation. Morally he thinks that though notably temperate, peaceful, and pure in their domestic lives, they are not today up to their old standards, since these centuries of oppression have forced them to habits of duplicity and crafty ways. They are devoted to gain, and doubtless greedy enough; though they are not alone in that. Mr. Dooley says, "a Connecticut Yankee would skin a Jew down to his collar-button"; and "when all the money in the world is gathered into the hands of any one class, the Jews won't have it; most of it will be in New England, with a few odd dollars in Scotland." The ordinary Jew's manners and morals may not be perfect, but an Englishman has said that it takes four generations to make a gentleman; and we hardly have to go back so much as that to find the Jew's ancestor in the Ghetto. With liberty he has improved, and rapidly. Says Heinrich Heine:

> In the book of Arabian Tales are seen princes changed into beasts, but who, with the day, again take their first form. Such has been the destiny of the Prince whom I sing. His name is Israel. Sorcerers have changed him into a dog, into a dog whipped by the children of the streets, into a dog with the thoughts of a dog: *Ein Hund mit hundischen Gedanken.*

Yes, adds Leroy-Beaulieu:

> During the centuries, Israel, Prince of the oriental countries, driven from the house of his royal father, has been metamorphosed into an animal, has been obliged to crawl at the feet of foreign masters, breaking with hunger and misery, and being despised by all who met him. But since, to the scandal of those who believed him made to be forever whipped and beaten, he has taken again his human form. The sorcerers who have degraded him have been only the laws which we have made against him; and freedom was the only fairy that was needed to restore him to more than his ancient glory.

India, America, and England*

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR

Mahatma Gandhi has endeared himself to the whole world. Not a few of his admirers, however, still persist in believing that he as well as the land that produced him is mysterious.

Dazzled by her splendors, baffled by her (to them) uncanny folkways and *mores,* freebooters, adventurers, invaders, travelers, and imperialists have chosen since the time of Alexander of Macedon to dub India a land of mystery.

I, for one, fail to see any mystery about India. This vast tropical subcontinent has its share of the bounties and niggardlinesses of nature: fertile lands and deserts, rivers and mountains, plains and valleys, mineral resources and rainfalls, forests and beasts, treacherous passes and vulnerable coastlines. The people are decent, hardworking folk, illiterate for the most part but cultured, reared on the spoken word rather than the written, some having more than their share of the good things of this life while many are starving, ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed. The mental outlook of the people bespeaks, in spots, the ill effects of prolonged subjugation to foreign rule; some of these ill effects, such as an inferiority complex, are tempered by a cultural heritage of many centuries. The mental outlook for the people has been undergoing a profound revolution for half a century. To read the story of this transformation of India's mind is to lay bare all the so-called mysteries about India.

Hindese (i. e., Indian) scholarship, tied to the apronstrings of England, has been too sterile to present a vivid picture of the living India. British propaganda is too occupied with specialized pleading to interpret

*This article is adapted from Dr. Muzumdar's Introduction to his forthcoming book *The United States of India.* See special offer on page 112.—*Editor.*

India accurately. And Mayoism is venomous enough to stoop to the perversion of truth. Ardent admirers of India, on the other hand, are gullible enough to pervert the truth at the other extreme.

There are in India 350 million people—one fifth of the population of the globe. What happens to so many inhabitants of the earth is a matter of profound concern to the whole world. The destiny of these people cannot be a matter of indifference to the Occidental world. Can you have a world half free and half enslaved? Furthermore, the Gandhi philosophy of life, transcending the bounds of nationality and creed, has implications for all of us.

The destinies of India and America are linked together much more intimately than is apparent on the surface. Columbus, India, and the New World—what a magnificent trinity! The golden age of American letters is associated with the New England School of Transcendentalism; this New England School of Transcendentalism was nurtured on the lore of the Hindus. And a distinguished member of this School, Henry David Thoreau, gave to Gandhi, and through Gandhi to India, the technique of non-violent revolution—yea the philosophy of civil disobedience.

India gave America the monitorial system of teaching-learning; America is today pointing out to India the way to the establishment of public schools, libraries, colleges, and research foundations.

The name of the unofficial parliament of India is, significantly, the Congress. The American Declaration of Independence and the Boston Tea Party are paralleled by India's Declaration of Independence and the Dandi Salt Party of Mahatma Gandhi.

William James spoke of the moral equivalent of war; Mahatma Gandhi has actually worked out this moral equivalent of war, the technique of non-violent non-coöperation as a substitute for violent warfare. James suggested that self-imposed poverty and renunciation were conducive to heroic virtues not one whit inferior to the martial virtues; Mahatma Gandhi has demonstrated the validity of this great American philosopher's thesis. America has been yearning for a warless world; Gandhi and India have been laboring to point "the way out" to our war-ridden world.

President Wilson's speeches had enthusiastic readers in India and gave a tremendous impetus to the nationalist resurgence, to the nationalist aspiration for self-determination—for Swaraj.

An American — the Reverend John Haynes Holmes, distinguished pastor of the Community Church of New York, was the first one, far back in 1921, to hail Gandhi as "the greatest man living in the world today." Gandhi, on his part, through his life and teachings, has been quietly but effectively making a positive contribution to the religious thinking of America.

The complex interrelationships between India and America have already played a significant part in the history of the world; they are destined to play a still larger rôle in the years to come.

American sympathy for India in her struggle for freedom has materially influenced British policy toward India. Sympathetic public opinion for India in the United States makes for a sympathetic public opinion for India in Britain.

The steady growth of the nationalist movement in India is one of the marvels of our times. And yet it is implicit in the internal logic of Hindese history.

A review of the nationalist awakening in India, undertaken in connection with the preparation of my forthcoming book *The United States of India,* has made me more sympathetic to the British point of view than I had ever been before. Time, patience, and the internal logic of events must be permitted to work out India's destiny. Today collaboration between the British and the Hindese is urgent—much more urgent than in the past.

One may pause for a moment to point out the psychological gulf dividing India and Britain. It would be difficult to imagine another people psychologically farther apart from the philosophically minded Hindese than the unimaginative, matter-of-fact British, rightly characterized by Napoleon as "a nation of shopkeepers"; yet the Goddess of Fate has played her little prank by bringing these two peoples into close, almost indispensable relations.

The British have no love for a written constitution—they swear by their unwritten constitution and go by precedents. The written word is only a signpost capable of pointing in any and every direction depending upon the circumstances, argue the British. The Hindese, on the other hand, though they have had many a bitter experience of "promises made to the ear and broken to the heart," insist on written guaranties for Swaraj. Nowhere in the whole range of British constitutional history do we find the term Dominion Status mentioned. It is impossible to discover a definition of the term. Yet the Dominions enjoy a status which is well understood by general convention.

The people of India are given to philosophizing. Political democracy is a new thing to them. They, therefore, want precise definitions and goals set forth in their dealings with England.

There are but two alternatives—only two ways out of the present impasse. Either England must cease looking upon a written constitution for India as a transitory instrument for the building up of precedents, or India must, within the framework of the present constitution, build up a body of precedents that will culminate in Swaraj.

To carry out the first alternative, the British Parliament must arm the All-India National Congress with full powers to convene a Constituent Assembly, consisting of not more than 500 members, in order to formulate a Bill of Rights and to implement the Bill of Rights with an instrument, a written constitution, to suit the needs of India.

If British statesmen fail to rise to the occasion,

(*Continued on page* 112)

The Field

(*Continued from page* 98)

them. They can lose nothing by trying the way of non-violence. The fate of Republican Spain is hanging in the balance. So is that of China. If in the end they all lose, they will do so not because their cause is not just, but because they are less skilled in the science of destruction or because they are undermanned. What would Republican Spain gain if it had Franco's resources, or China if she had Japan's skill in war, or the Czechs if they had the skill of Herr Hitler? I suggest that if it is brave, as it is, to die to a man fighting against odds, it is braver still to refuse to fight and yet to refuse to yield to the usurper."—*Nofrontier News Service.*

(*Continued from page* 111)

Hindese statesmen should make the most of the Federation as contemplated in the India Act of 1935 and build up a body of precedents that will spell Swaraj for India.

It is immaterial whether the Hindese Raj of the morrow be labeled Dominion Status or Independence or Autonomy. What is wanted is, in the words of the late C. R. Das, "Swaraj for 98 per cent of the people."

Given good will on both sides, Hindese and British, India's march to freedom and democracy is assured.

Mahatma Gandhi *ki jai!*—Victory to Mahatma Gandhi!

Correspondence

Our Brethren the Jews

Editor of UNITY:

Is one man justified in torturing another man? If he believes God has given him this power of torture, by what right does he believe that it was God who gave him this power?

Today the Jews of Germany are suffering a persecution so horrible in its intensity that only slaves subjected to the cruelist slavery could understand and experience its meaning. Crawling on their hands and knees by order of the German government, hundreds of Jews have made their pitiful way to the border of Czechoslovakia though Czechoslovakia has refused, as have other countries, to give them refuge from this modern agony of oppression. Once more, as they have always been, these Jews are the wandering Israelities, now forced to crawl on their bellies, rather than wander to that "unknown where," bereft of all their possessions, homeless, and forsaken.

Is there no answer and no end to the suffering of the Jewish people?

In my humble opinion, it is up to the democratic and so-called Christian countries to find an answer, and it can be found in the generosity and friendship of such nations as America, England, France, the South American Republics, and Russia. With the British Empire covering an area of one-fourth of the world, surely in some of her colonies, like Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and India, there would be sufficient territory to yield at least a small part to the Jews. The United States, also, has territory at her disposal, and so have the French colonies.

If we in America would uphold the constitution and respect the ideals of freedom and justice embodied therein, let us now as a real Christian nation extend a helping hand to the Jews all over the world, but most of all to the Jews subjected to the agonies of Nazi oppression. Let us, as Americans and human beings, make it possible for the great race of Jesus to have everlasting light and peace.

PATRICIA SPRAGUE.

New York, N. Y.

Beginning in the issue of January 2 UNITY will publish in consecutive numbers a four-part article

RELEASED FROM BONDAGE

By Synnove Larsen Baasch

relating experiences with sharecroppers in Missouri.

• SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER •

TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS

A year's subscription to UNITY and a copy of **The United States of India** by Haridas T. Muzumdar

for $3.50

The usual subscription price of UNITY is $3.00 and the regular price of **The United States of India** is $2.00. This combination effects a saving of $1.50.

Topics discussed in **The United States of India:**

I. India's Cultural Nationalism. II. The Dynamic of Islam. III. European Intrusion Into India. IV. John Company's Balance Sheet. V. The Rajah and the Swami. VI. Antecedents of Political Nationalism. VII. Birth of the Hindese Nation. VIII. New Nationalism. IX. Evolution of India's Constitution—(a) Morley-Minto Reforms (1909), (b) Montford Reforms (1919), (c) India Act of 1935. X. The Lull Before the Storm. XI. The Emergence of Gandhi. XII. Evolution of the Congress. XIII. Problems of Reconstruction. XIV. A Seven-Point Program. XV. The United States of India. XVI. Hail Motherland! In the seventeenth and last section the author renders an account of his activities on behalf of India in the United States of America both to the people of India and of America.

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

I enclose $3.50 for the special combination offer of a year's subscription to UNITY and a copy of Dr. Muzumdar's forthcoming book **The United States of India.**

Send UNITY to:

Name .....

Street .....

City and State.....

Send the book to:.....

Name .....

Street .....

City and State.....

Act Promptly! This offer expires on December 31, 1938, for North America; on January 31, 1939, for other countries.